



2151 New Village Rd., Stewartsville, NJ 08886

118

February 25, 1998

RECEIVED

MAR 09 1998

GROUP 3200

The Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231

RE: Patent Application No. 08/646,954 filed 05/08/96
Examiners Joni Danganan, and D.S. Meislin

Honorable Commissioner:

I have filed over twenty patent applications with the P.T.O. throughout the years and in virtually all cases I have been very satisfied with the professional conduct of the examiners and the quality of the examination process. This is the first time ever I felt the need to communicate to you a formal complaint regarding the examination process of the above referenced case.

Specifically, I am very disappointed and frustrated with the quality of the examination process and the examiner's arguments for the second office action. Is it proper and reasonable for the examiner to reject claims based upon the "Lawrie" prior art, or did Ms. Meislin simply select this prior art because she previously handled that case, even though "Lawrie" does not disclose a single element of my invention?

In addition, is it proper and reasonable to broadly interpret the "alignment sleeve" of a "universal joint" as being the same as a wrench "gripping means"? The examiner thinks so on page 9, at lines 3-6, "Broadly interpreted, Lawrie teaches a gripping means (10)! Again, is it proper and reasonable to cite the "Lawrie" prior art when the function and objective of the "alignment sleeve" is clearly unrelated to the function and objective of my wrench "gripping means"?

After a phone conversation with Ms. Danganan in December, she indicated that she would review the prior art with her supervisor and get back to me. She never did, and after three unreturned messages and the entire month of January I was finally able to reach her at her desk. At that time, she was clearly uninterested in assisting me or advising me in a manner that would move my case forward. This was particularly disappointing because I was handling this application myself without an attorney, and I had now lost an entire month of response time because of her failure to return my calls.

- 2 -

To make matters worst, this application is a continuation-in-part of copending application 08/500,178 which was filed on July 10, 1995 and is now under appeal because of the same examiner and her position.

I fear that this application 08/646,954 is also heading towards an unwarranted appeal.

I would appreciate whatever assistance you can give me regarding this matter, and hope that you will have the appropriate representative review this case and advise me accordingly, as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Richard J. Macor
Inventor

cc: Ms. MaryAnne Villemi

Ms. Joni Danganan
Ms. D.S. Meislin